

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-25 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicants add new claims 23-25.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 1, 3-5, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over JP Publication No. 10-224591 to Izumi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,166,825 to Shaklee *et al.* ("Shaklee"). For *at least* the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

In order to expedite prosecution, Applicants amend claim 1 by this Amendment. Applicants submit that amended claim 1 is patentable over the alleged combination of Izumi and Shaklee. For example, claim 1 relates to a print system having a printer controlling device and a printer. The printer performs printing on the basis of print data including a plurality of data segments inputted from said printer controlling device. The print system comprises, *inter alia*, first communication means for conducting high-speed radio data-communication between said printer controlling device and said printer, and second communication means for conducting low-speed radio data-communication between said printer controlling device and said printer. A predetermined data segment is transferred from said printer controlling device to said printer by using said first communication means. Another data segment is transferred from said printer controlling device to said printer by using said second communication means. The printer performs a print job based on the predetermined data segment and the other data segment.

The Examiner acknowledges that Izumi does not disclose the predetermined data segment being transferred by the first communication means or the other data being transferred

by the second communication means as required by claim 1. Office Action at page 3, last paragraph. However, the Examiner contends that Shaklee cures these deficient teachings of Izumi. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the control messages transferred via the low speed serial communication pathway in Shaklee between a computer component 100 and print engine component 300 disclose “the other data segment being transferred from said printer controlling device to said printer by using said second communication means” as set forth in claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As an initial matter, Applicants point out that it was already shown in the previous Amendment filed October 9, 2007 that the **feedback** control messages (allegedly the other data segment) in Shaklee that are used to control the transmission of printable pixel data, are sent **from the print engine component 300 to the computer component 100** via the low-speed serial cable 122 (see previous Amendment, pages 10 and 11). The Examiner did not respond to these arguments despite relying on the same portions of Shaklee for allegedly teaching the above-noted features of claim 1, **rendering the current Office Action incomplete**. Applicants respectfully remind the Examiner that the MPEP § 706.07(f) dictates “[w]here the applicant traverses any rejection, the examiner should, if he or she repeats the rejection, take note of the applicant's argument and answer the substance of it” (emphasis added). Since Shaklee is still used to reject the same features of claim 1, the previously submitted arguments in response to this portion of the rejection **must** be addressed.

Applicants maintain that Shaklee does not teach or suggest the predetermined data segment being transferred by the first communication means or the other data being transferred by the second communication means as required by claim 1. For instance, Shaklee’s serial cable 122 is **unidirectional** (Shaklee, col. 2, lines 38-43). Applicants point out that Shaklee’s print

engine component 300 corresponds closest to the facsimile equipment 602 in Izumi, which the Examiner contends discloses the claimed printer. Shaklee's computer component 100 corresponds closest to the digital camera 603 in Izumi, which the Examiner contends discloses the claimed printer controlling device. As such, even if a skilled artisan were to draw from the teachings of Shaklee to modify Izumi's system, the modified system still would not teach or suggest transferring another data segment (i.e., other than the predetermined data segment) from the claimed printer controlling device to the claimed printer by using said second communication means. Shaklee explicitly teaches unidirectional transmission of the feedback control messages from the print engine component 300 to the computer component 100.

Furthermore, as a skilled artisan would easily infer, feedback control messages from a print engine component 300 would be based on information gathered on the printer engine component 300 side. For example, Shaklee discloses in col. 2, lines 52-59 that "[a]fter processing a row printable pixel data for exposing the photosensitive medium, the print engine component gathers state information on the print engine component through either a polling scheme or an interrupt scheme. Based on the state information received, feedback control messages are then transmitted from the print engine component over the low-speed cable to the computer component". That is, the feedback control messages are dependent on state information of the print engine component. Thus, it is clear that the Examiner is incorrectly transforming the feedback control messages which cannot be sent from a computer component 100 (corresponding to Izumi's digital camera 603) to the print engine component 300 (corresponding to Izumi's facsimile equipment 602) in an effort to disclose the other data segment in claim 1 that is transferred from a printer controlling device to a printer.

In addition, the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the newly added claim feature reciting that the printer performs a print job based on the predetermined data segment and the other data segment. For example, in Izumi, a high speed channel and a low speed channel are used for separate functions. The high speed channel is used to transmit image data to the facsimile machine 602 for printing the image data at the facsimile machine 602. The low speed channel is used to transmit data of the same image, but compressed relative to the data transmitted via the high speed channel, to the facsimile 602. The low speed channel is used when it is desired to further transmit the image data to a recipient via the ISDN network 601. As such, the facsimile machine 602 is used as a transmitter instead of a printer. On the other hand, claim 1 requires usage of the predetermined data segment and the other data segment for performing a print job.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the combined teachings of Izumi and Shaklee do not teach or suggest all the features of amended claim 1 in as complete detail as set forth in the claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 1.

Claims 9 and 13 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 9 and 13 are patentable for *at least* reasons similar to those given above with respect to claim 1. Moreover, the Examiner does not address the feature of turning off the first communication means when reception of said image data is not conducted as previously set forth in claims 9 and 13 (also recited in claim 2 which depends from claim 1). As discussed below with respect to claim 2, the prior art of record also does not disclose or suggest this additional feature of claims 9 and 13. By this Amendment, in order to expedite prosecution, claims 9 and 13 have been amended to further specify that only said first

communication means is turned off when reception (or transmission as set forth in claim 13) of said image data is not conducted. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment places claims 9 and 13 in immediate condition for allowance.

Claims 3-5, 10, 14, 16, and 20-22 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency on the independent claims. Further, claim 4 is patentable for reasons other than its dependency.

Claim 4 recites that the printer controlling device is a digital camera for producing said print data by adding the print-setting data to the image data. That is, the claimed digital camera adds the print-setting data to the image data itself. The Examiner contends that paragraph [0058] of Izumi discloses this feature. Office Action at page 4, third full paragraph. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Examiner asserts that adding a header to the image data according to a protocol discloses adding the print-setting data to image data. However, as noted above, in claim 4, the digital camera adds the print-setting data to the image data. On the other hand, Izumi's digital camera 603 (allegedly the claimed digital camera) does not add the header to the image data. Rather, the facsimile equipment 602, specifically the CPU 701 of the facsimile equipment 602, adds the header to the image data during dispatch processing after it receives the image data from the digital camera 603 (Izumi, paragraphs [0054]-[0058]). As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Izumi and Shaklee, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest a digital camera that produces print data by adding the print-setting data to the image data as set forth in claim 4.

Claims 2, 12, 15, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Izumi in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/001,6378 to Ozawa *et al.* (“Ozawa”)<sup>1</sup>.

Claims 2, 12, 15, and 17-19 depend from independent claims 1, 9, or 13. Since Ozawa does not cure the deficient teachings of Izumi and Shaklee with respect to claims 1, 9, or 13, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 12, 15, and 17-19 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency. Applicants further submit that claim 2 is patentable for reasons other than its dependency.

For example, claim 2 recites that said first communication means is turned off when the data communication of the predetermined data segment is not conducted. The Examiner contends that operation S1316 in FIG. 28 of Ozawa discloses this feature. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Operation S1316 of Ozawa relates to the detection of a presence/absence of depression of the power switch 407 (Ozawa, paragraph [0160])<sup>2</sup>. Paragraph [0106] of Ozawa discloses that the power switch 407 is used for tuning on/off the power supply of the digital camera 10 shown in FIG. 18. Claim 2 explicitly recites that the first communication means is turned off. Ozawa discloses only one communication channel between the digital camera 10 and the printer 12 (e.g., the infrared channel 903 in FIG. 25 or the serial communication cable 1201 in FIG. 26). Thus, Ozawa cannot specifically disclose turning off a specific communication means in a

---

<sup>1</sup> The statement of rejection for claims 2, 15, and 17-19 on page 5 should include Shaklee, and the statement of rejection for claim 12 should include Shaklee and Omura by virtue of its dependency on claims 9-11.

<sup>2</sup> Applicants note that although paragraph [0160] states “power switch 404”, it appears that the switch being referred to is actually “power switch 407” in view of paragraph [0106] of Ozawa.

system having more than one communication means, let alone disclose turning off the first communication means when data communication of the predetermined data segment is not conducted.

Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Izumi in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0140963 to Otsuka. Claims 8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Izumi and U.S. Patent No. 6,999,113 to Omura<sup>3</sup>.

Claims 6-7 depend from claim 1. Since Otsuka does not cure the deficient teachings of Izumi and Shaklee with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6-7 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Claims 8 and 11 depend from claims 1 and 9, respectively. Since Omura does not cure the deficient teachings of Izumi and Shaklee with respect to claims 1 and 9, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8 and 11 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

***New claims***

New claims 23-25 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency on independent claims 1, 9, and 13. Furthermore, claims 23 and 24 are patentable for reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 25 recites that the first communication means and the second communication means conduct the high-speed radio data-communication and the low-speed radio data-communication according to **different** communication standards, respectively. On the other

---

<sup>3</sup> The statements of rejection of both claims 6 and 7, and claims 8 and 11 on page 7 should include Shaklee.

hand, as disclosed in paragraph [0047] of Izumi, only one communication standard is used in Izumi. Therefore, claim 25 is patentable over the prior art of record.

***Conclusion***

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Quadeer A. Ahmed  
Registration No. 60,835

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 1, 2008